



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/703,919 | 10/30/2000 | Farrukh S. Najmi | SUN1P293 | 3191 |

22434 7590 02/22/2005

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP
P.O. BOX 70250
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KIANERSI, MITRA

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2145

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/703,919

Applicant(s)

NAJMI, FARRUKH S.

Examiner

Mitra Kianersi

Art Unit

2145

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mitra Kianersi.

(3) _____.

(2) Fredrik Mollborn
Reg.No.48,587.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Skeen et al. (US.No.5,966,531).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an
Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Application rep requested an interview regarding the above mentioned application. The steps of claim 1 was discussed. It was agreed that the term "a message service" and "a message service" used in same written form in all steps of the claim. Also the "message service" is a very broad term, since it can be any kind of communication system, The applicant rep has agreed to modify the language of the claim and make it more specific. After submission of interview summary, examiner waits for the application response..

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

JAN. 27. 2005 9:54AM

16509618301

NO. 725 P. 1

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

590 W. El Camino Real, Mountain View, CA 94040
Telephone: (650) 961-8300 Facsimile: (650) 961-8301
www.beyerlaw.com

FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

January 27, 2005

Receiver: Mitra Kianersi
Art Unit 2143

TEL #:

FAX #: 571-273-3915

Sender: Fredrik Mollborn, Reg. No. 48,587

Re: Proposed Topic for Requested Interview
Application No. 09/703,919
Attorney Docket Number SUN1P193/P5169

Pages Including Cover Sheet(s): 3

MESSAGE:

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTE

The information contained in this facsimile (FAX) message is legally privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the receiver or firm named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended receiver, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this FAX is strictly prohibited. If you have received this FAX in error, please immediately notify the sender at the telephone number provided above and return the original message to the sender at the address above via the United States Postal Service. Thank you.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Farrukh S. NAJMI

Attorney Docket No.: SUN1P293/P5169

Application No.: 09/703,919

Examiner: KIANERSI, Mitra

Filed: October 30, 2000

Group: 2143

Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR
PROVIDING AN E-BUSINESS AUDIT TRAIL IN
A DISTRIBUTED COMPUTING SYSTEMConfirmation No.: 3191

PROPOSED TOPIC FOR REQUESTED INTERVIEW

Dear Examiner Kianersi:

As requested in your voicemail of yesterday, we hereby submit the proposed topics for the telephone interview we have scheduled for Thursday, February 3, 2005 at 2 p.m. The case is currently under first action after RCE.

To simplify the issues for the interview, we would like to focus primarily on independent claim 1, which is reproduced below. Initially, we would like to focus on the language of claim 1 relating to the "administrator." The relevant claim language is bolded in the reproduction of claim 1 below.

1. A method of memorializing an e-business audit trail, comprising:
 - determining if a message is to be sent to a subscriber by a message service;
 - if the message is to be sent, determining if an administrator coupled to the message service is running;**
 - if the administrator is running, storing the message in a corresponding topic in the administrator;**
 - if the administrator is not running, storing the message by the message service;
 - if the administrator is running, storing a response to the sent message in the topic in the administrator corresponding to the sent message;**
 - if the administrator is not running, storing the response by the message service; and
 - creating an audit trail by retrieving the stored sent message and the corresponding response.**

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In particular, we would like to focus on the use of the administrator to store a message (and a response to the message) in a corresponding topic in the administrator, and how an audit trail is created by retrieving the stored sent message and the corresponding response.

The currently outstanding rejection relies on a single reference (Skeen) as anticipating the administrator and the operations thereof in the claimed context. We have not been able to identify any disclosure in Skeen that teaches an administrator (or the operations performed by the administrator) in the context of the claimed method of memorializing an e-business audit trail. Accordingly we have had some difficulty in understanding the outstanding rejection and would appreciate the opportunity to discuss the scope and meaning of the cited claim language and the applicability of the references to that claim language.

We look forward to talking to you on Thursday next week. If you have any questions before then, please give me a call at (650) 961-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Fredrik Mollborn

Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100